HVN

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

C.A.J.

F.E.R.A. No. 32 of 2006

Director of Enforcement ... Appellant

Versus

R.P. Vachha ... Respondent

ALONGWITH
F.E.R.A. NO. 34 of 2006

Director of Enforcement ... Appellant

Versus

R.P. Vachha ... Respondent

ALONGWITH
F.E.R.A. NO. 35 OF 2006

Director of Enforcement ... Appellant

Versus

E. Pinto ... Respondent

ALONGWITH
F.E.R.A. NO. 36 OF 2006

Director of Enforcement ... Appellant

Versus

E. Pinto ... Respondent

Mr. R.V. Desai with Mrs. Shehnaz V. Bharucha and Mr. A.S. Rao i/by Mr. T.C. Kaushik for Appellant.

Mr. P.D. Ghandy with Ms. Samidha Vedpathak i/by Maneksha & Sethna for Respondents.

CORAM: F.I. REBELLO &
J.P.DEVADHAR, JJ.
DATED: AUGUST 10, 2007

P.C.:

. These are the appeals preferred by the appellants against the order of the tribunal. The corresponding Appeal numbers before the appellate authority are 214/99, 216/99, 217/99, 218/99. The respondents in each of these cases were charged for contravention of sections 16(1)(a) and 16(1)(b). On the consideration of the evidence the learned tribunal addressed itself to various aspects and relied on the judgments cited. The learned tribunal held that the degree of proof which was required to be discharged by the department had not been discharged and that there was no material to show that each of the appellants before it was in charge of the company and accordingly allowed the appeals and set aside the penalty imposed.

. We have perused the impugned findings. We do not find that the findings are perverse warranting interference by this court in appeal. In the light of that appeals stand dismissed.

(J.P.DEVADHAR, J.) **(F.I.REBELLO, J.)**